Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Synopses of Important Articles.

THE FOUR PERIODS OF THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH. By REV. G. DOUGLAS, B.D., in *The Thinker* for May, 1894. Pp. 397–403.

With few exceptions the prophecies of this book fall into the following groups:

1. First four years of Jehoiakim, B.C. 608–605; 2. First four years of Zedekiah, B.C. 597–594; 3. Last three years of Zedekiah, B.C. 589–587; 4. A short period following the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 587.

I. *The first four years of Jehoiakim.* Period of Warning.—With Jehoiakim's accession, the work of Josiah was reversed. The idols which had been so zealously put down were set up again in every city. A prophet who had joined heartily in the reforms of Josiah must make a new departure in his ministry. Jeremiah was guided to this by two visions. The vision of the almond or "waking" tree and that of the boiling pot. By these visions the prophet was called to gird himself with greater determination to resist increasing opposition.

These visions and the early chapters of Jeremiah, are not assigned, as is usually done, to the reign of Josiah, because: 1. The Book of Jeremiah does not mention: the finding of the Book of the Law; the reforms of Josiah; the battle of Megiddo; the death of the king. 2. Because it does mention: unrestrained idolatry; dependence on Egypt instead of Chaldea; an imminent invasion. Therefore, the main body of the book must have arisen after the accession of Jehoiakim. Further, that this must have had its origin before the end of the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign is evident from the references to the persecution, which was a consequence of the prophet's fearless preaching. This kept him in enforced concealment till the death of the king. The prophecies of this period are, with slight exceptions, chapters 1–20; 22; 23; 25; 26; 35:46–51, and, as appendices belonging to the following year, chapters 36 and 45.

II. *The first four years of Zedekiah.* Comfort to the exiles.—On the death of Jehoiakim it was safe for Jeremiah to leave his seclusion. Jehoiachin, the son and successor of Jehoiakim, and all his "men of might" had been taken to Babylon. Jeremiah is again called upon to make a new departure in his ministry, and is again prepared by a vision, that of the two baskets of figs. Up to this time the prophet had looked to Babylon with dread; now, however, Babylon was the seat of hope. Accordingly, he sent a letter to the captives exhorting them to live quietly in the city to which they had been transported, and assured them that at the end of seventy years they should return. To this period belong chapters 24; 29; 27; 28:57, 59–64.

III. *The last three years of Zedekiah.* The prophet in prison; his vision of the restored kingdom.—After the fourth year of Zedekiah, we again lose sight of the prophet until his ninth year, when the Babylonians are besieging the city. When on his way to go into the land of Benjamin, the prophet was seized and cast into prison, and was not freed until the city was taken. During his imprisonment he often gave advice to the weak king regarding the siege, and to the people concerning their safety. But his mind was most frequently filled with thoughts of the future. Very often he assured the faithful that "vineyards should yet again be bought in that land": that God's covenant would surely be fulfilled. At this time chapters 30 and 31, which contain the highest of his teachings, were written. To this period belong chapters 21; 30–34; 37; 38; 39, 15–18.

IV. *A short period following the destruction of Jerusalem.* Flight into Egypt. Chapters 40–44. This period is not commented upon.

A very interesting article and one which, while inviting to the further study of the details of the prophet's life, does not alter our conceptions of his work as a whole.

L. A. J.

THE BOOK OF JONAH. ITS AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF COMPOSITION. By REV. JOHN KENNEDY, A.M., D.D., in *The Thinker* for April, 1894. Pp. 307–315.

Disregarding the linguistic argument as of slight value on either side, Dr. Kennedy defends the early date of the book, and enumerates the external considerations that mark the prophet Jonah as the author. Regarding the question of date there is to be noted the fact that Nineveh, destroyed so completely in B. C. 606, that Herodotus and Xenophon, a hundred and fifty and two hundred years later respectively, were ignorant of its location, is referred to in the Book of Jonah not only as a well-known capitol, but familiar in its features; which would have been impossible had the book been written long after the city perished. Moreover the coloring of the prophecy is in harmony with the age from which it purports to come, and not with the exilic or post-exilic time. It is a severe strain to which the doctrine of prophetic inspiration is subjected by the supposition that it lifted the prophet out of all touch with the present and transported him into the atmosphere of a distant past. Quoting Orelli as characterizing the mission of Jonah as an epoch-making event, the question occurs how could so important an event remain unrecorded for from two to four hundred years, as the late date assumes? All other leading events in Hebrew history were speedily chronicled, and it is scarcely probable that this was an exception. The book is didactic, but so is every other scripture. Jonah is, however, marked by a close adherence to events, with no moralizing digressions. It leaves the facts to make their own impress. As regards authorship, if Jonah himself, the prophet of whom the

book speaks, be not the author, where in the later times is a writer to be found? Its author must have been a prophet, and the prophets were not obscure men. No one save the chief actor in the book was familiar with the facts. If a post-exilic writer gave the book its literary form, he must have had records from Jonah himself. To be sure, the book makes no claim to be the work of Jonah, but it nowhere disclaims it. The whole character of the narrative, the unworthy part performed by the prophet himself, and the importance of the mission as worthy of immediate record, all make reasonable the supposition that as a prophet who had accomplished a great work with slight credit to himself, but great blessing to others, Jonah should tell the story of his preaching at Nineveh.

It is a question whether the linguistic indications of later date, the invariable reference to the prophet in the third person, the fairly pointed notes of retrospection in the narrative and the greater resemblance of the book to exilic and post-exilic literature, are to be dismissed with the assurance which characterizes Dr. Kennedy's treatment. The weight of the two leading arguments (1) that Nineveh was forgotten in exilic times, and (2) that the writer could not transport himself into a distant past, is seriously compromised by the considerations (a) that Nineveh would scarcely be orgotten by a people who had suffered so severely at her hands, as contrasted with the Greeks whose acquaintance with the east was late, and (b) that the familiarity shown with the city is exceedingly slight and general. The second argument proves too much for the conservative position. If a prophet may not transport himself into a somewhat remote past to reproduce its events for religious purposes, would it be possible for him to place himself a century or more in advance of his day, and from that point speak his message, as is presumed regarding the prophecies of Daniel and the later chapters of Isaiah? The article affords an interesting view of the more popular and external argument for the early date of the book. H. L. W.

THE PROPHETS AND SACRIFICE. By Professor ANDREW HARPER, in *The Expositor* for April, 1894. Pp. 241–253.

It seems necessary to take exception to the teaching of the later critical school on the subject of sacrifice. The critics maintain that sacrifice was in no way a condition of the divine covenant with Israel; that the prophets denounced it when it was put forward as such, and instead of valuing it, repudiated it; but that after the exile it was adopted by the prophets even as essential, and thus came to be the central idea of Christianity.

Now not only has sacrifice been an indispensable element of worship in all ancient religions, but in the Semitic and especially the later Jewish religion, the close connection between it and the forgiveness of sins is fundamental, and in passing to Christianity, whose dominating idea has hitherto been the sacrificial and atoning nature of the death of Christ, its importance is very manifest. *A priori*, therefore, it seems to many hardly likely that the religion of Jehovah should have been meant to be from the beginning independent of

the one universally understood mode of worship, or that the foundation of the thought which has in the long run proved dominant in true religion should have been, during the whole history of Israel as a nation, regarded as an inheritance from heathendom which was merely coldly tolerated.

The critics—more specifically Professor Robertson Smith—quote Amos 2 : 10 and 5 : 25 ; Micah 6 : 8 ; and Jeremiah 7 : 21, *seq.*, to substantiate their belief that the prophets conceived sacrifice not necessary to acceptable religion and not to be a positive divine institution. These passages do not need to be interpreted in so liberal and strenuous a manner. Another meaning more consonant with the historical facts seems quite as fair and more desirable.

It is hardly conceivable that Jeremiah, who was so closely connected with the promulgation of the newly-found book as by some to be considered its author, would have repudiated the direct and positive injunctions of Deuteronomy uttered in the name of Moses and of God. Moreover, two interpreta tions of the Jeremiah passage are perfectly in accord with sound exegesis. Jeremiah may mean that Jehovah gave them no command concerning burnt offering and sacrifice comparable in emphasis with that by which he enjoined them to obey his voice ; or, here the prophet may be simply reasoning on the letter of Deuteronomy, simply pointing out what Deuteronomy states. In that narrative of what took place at Sinai, Jehovah did not speak to the fathers concerning burnt offerings and sacrifice. He spoke only the decalogue and the other ordinances were spoken by Moses.

The Micah passage is perhaps the strongest for the opposition. It, however, does not state that sacrifice had never been divinely commanded, nor does it repudiate it *per se*, but rather rebukes the people for their low conception of Jehovah's character as a moral being who can be won over by ritualistic zeal or abundance of sacrifice. Such an interpretation seems necessary in view of the pre-existing Book of the Covenant.

With regard to Amos's statement about the wilderness journey, the second of the interpretations offered for the Jeremiah passage applies. He is not giving a different tradition from that which the oldest records contain, but merely using as an argument what he finds in them. In J E there is no record of systematic sacrifice in the wilderness. Sacrifice is simply taken for granted and some instructions given regarding it. Amos' argument is mainly this. During the wilderness journey there is no record of sacrifice having been offered. Yet that was the time above all in which Jehovah specially revealed himself to his people in love. Consequently sacrifice cannot be the first and main element in the covenant with Jehovah as ye are making it.

In brief, one does not care to combat the critical position that sacrifice had its broadest signification and its deep atoning meaning in the late Levitical code, but rather the position of those who hold that the prophets deny any ritual and divinely-given place to sacrifice in the religion of Israel.

H. F. M.

THE HEBREW LEGEND OF CIVILIZATION IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT DISCOVERY. By W. ST. CHAD BOSCAWEN, in *The Expository Times* for May, 1894. Pp. 351–56.

The Hebrew account of the ten antediluvian patriarchs has its parallels in Egyptian and Assyrian story, and all agree in placing the beginning of civilization and of class distinctions in the period before the flood. The record of this beginning in Genesis is given us by the Jehovist who consistently ascribes the fall to man's desire for forbidden knowledge, and assigns the beginnings of the arts of civilization to Cain, the murderer. The article aims to show what light has been thrown upon this fourth chapter of Genesis by recent discoveries in Chaldea.

In Cain and Abel we have the progenitors of the two primitive classes, the agriculturalist and the nomad, and in the fratricide we have the beginning of that enmity between the two classes, which is brought out again in the story of Jacob and Esau, and is still seen in the lasting feud between the Bedaween and the Fellaheen. In this struggle, the agriculturalist prevails over the shepherd. In the Jehovist's eyes, civilization and sin are connected. It is by deceit that the more polished and domestic Jacob takes away the birthright of the huntsman, Esau. Nathan rebukes David's desire to build to Jehovah a costly house, for Jehovah has been satisfied to dwell in a tent, and the work of Elijah, the great "prophet of the desert," is a nomad's protest against the luxury of the court of Ahab and Jezebel.

Under the Hebrew dispensation, it is the life of the shepherd that pleases the god of the land. Abel's sacrifice is accepted. The curse upon Adam involves the laborious tilling of the soil. But in Chaldea, the gardener's occupation is an honored one, and from the time of Sargon I, 3800 B. C., the word *ingar* a "gardener," is found among the royal titles.

Cain for his punishment became a fugitive and a vagabond, and went forth and dwelt in the land of Nod. The same root, *nadu*, to wander, is found frequently in Assyrian inscriptions, and in various connections and forms is applied to the mixed nations that inhabited the mountains to the east of the Tigris and to the Scythians, who, from time to time, swept down upon the fertile plains of Chaldea. Here, in these mountains, the original home of the Akkadians, the Turanian population of Chaldea, was the first building of cities and development of arts and sciences. Recently discovered monuments in Chaldea bear out the implication of Gen. 4 : 17, that in this "region of the wanderers" in Elam was the earliest seat of civilization.

According to Gen. 4 : 17, Cain's first city was Enoch or Khanock. The name of the most ancient capital of Chaldea in the Gizdhubar legend is *Uruki*, the Erech of Gen. 10:10, but this is merely the Semiticised form of the older Akkadian name *Unu-ki*, *Unug*, the equivalent phonetically of the Hebrew Enoch, which appears in Gen. 4 : 17. Cain's first city then was Ereck or Unuk, the first capital of Chaldea. Then if we may understand the

names in the genealogy as geographical rather than personal, we have in Irad, the son of Enoch, the old Semitic Babylonian *Eridu*, the southern sacred city of Chaldea.

In Lamech we have the Hebrew form of the Akkadian Lamga, the Moon-god whose seat of worship was at Ur. Adah, Assyrian *edhute* "darkness," and Zillah, *tsillu*, "shade," were appropriate consorts of the Moon-god. If now, in Gen. 4 : 20, we read for *ohel*, "cities" instead of "tents," a sense which it sometimes has in Hebrew and always has in its Assyrian form *alu*, we shall have the descendants of Jubal, the son of Adah, to be "such as dwell in cities and have cattle," which would exactly describe the population of Ur, Erech, Sippara, and other large cities. In the seventh Creation tablet we find a distinction between the *bulu ali* or cattle of the towns and the *bulu tseri* or cattle of the desert plain. The descendants of Jubal then will be not nomads but men of a higher stage of civilization, the inhabitants of cities.

In Jubal, we have the inventor of instruments of music. In thus placing the arts of pleasure before those of utility, the Hebrew legend is in accord with what we find in most primitive stages of society, and it is worthy of note that the two instruments mentioned here, the harp and pipe, are the two that we find pictured on the earliest Chaldean monuments dating back before 3000 B.C. A consideration of the names of these two instruments, the *kinnor* and the *ugab* goes to show that the *kinnor* was so named from the name of a certain town of Kinunir mentioned in one of the lists of the gods, where it would appear that the worship of Tammuz Adonis was prominent, a worship closely associated with music; and the second instrument, the *ugab*, is probably the *gi-bu* or long reed-pipe used as a flute in Chaldean religious services and mentioned in inscriptions.

The last step in the progress of civilization is taken in the working of copper and iron, and the name Tubal-Cain is discussed and the successive stages in the development of metallurgy. Copper is mentioned in the earliest hymns, but iron seems to have been a late production. As late as the ninth century B.C., axes of bronze are used to cut paths through the mountains. Iron seems to have been first developed in Palestine, and the discoveries of Mr. Bliss at Tel Hesy (Lachish) seem to show that the smelting of iron was understood in Palestine in pre-Israelite times.

The purpose of the articles, to throw light on Gen. 4, from recent Chaldean discoveries, is well carried out, and the point is well sustained that the progress of civilization as given in that chapter corresponds in all essential particulars with what we know of early Chaldean civilization as it appears in the monuments.

D. A. W.